



Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR			ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.		
09/584,978	06/02/00	NEIRINCKX		D			
Г				EXAMINER			
		HM12/0828	•	MOEZIE_E			
AGYS PHARMA DR RUDI NEIRINCKX				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
3 RUE DU VIGNOBLE F 68 440 DIETWILLER FRANCE		- AIR MAIL		1653 Date Mailed	08/28/01		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks** 

•

Office Action Summary		Application No. Applicar		nt(s) Neirinckx						
		09/584,978			TINNETHERING THE HAR WITH					
		Examiner F. MOEZIE		Art Unit <b>1653</b>						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address										
Period for Reply										
THE N	A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>one</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.									
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed										
after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will										
be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this										
<ul> <li>Find period for reply is specified above, the maximum statuter, period that appropriate an appropriate approprise approprise approprise appropriote appropriate appropriate a</li></ul>										
<ul> <li>Failure to reply within the set of extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the upplication to become reply the original period for reply will, by statute, cause the upplication to become replying the original period for reply will, by statute, cause the upplication to become replying the original period for reply will, by statute, cause the upplication to become replying the original period for reply will, by statute, cause the upplication to become replying the original period for reply will, by statute, cause the upplication to become replying the original period for reply will, by statute, cause the upplication to become replying the original period for reply will, by statute, cause the upplication to become replying the original period for reply will, by statute, cause the upplication to become replying the original period for reply will, by statute, cause the upplication to become replying the original period for reply will, by statute, cause the upplication to become replying the original period for reply will, by statute, cause the upplication to become replying the original period for reply will, by statute, cause the upplication to become replying the original period for reply will, by statute, cause the upplication to become replying the original period.</li> </ul>										
Status										
1) 🗙	Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jun 2, 2	000	, <b></b> ,		· · ·					
2a) 🗌	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) $\overleftarrow{X}$ This ac	tion is non-final.								
3) 🗌	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.									
Disposition of Claims										
4) 🔀	Claim(s) <u>1-12</u>	·	is/ar	e pending in t	he application.					
4	ła) Of the above, claim(s)									
5) 🗌	Claim(s) is/are allowed.									
6) 🗌	6) 🗌 Claim(s)				is/are rejected.					
7) 🗌	Claim(s) is/are objected to.									
8) 🔀										
Applica	tion Papers									
9) 🗌	9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.									
10)	) The drawing(s) filed on is/are objected to by the Examiner.									
11)										
12)										
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119									
13) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).										
a) All b) Some* c) None of:										
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.										
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No									
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).										
*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 14) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).										
Attachm		••• 🗖 • • • •		N= (-)						
_	Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	18) Interview Summary								
	16)       Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)       19)       Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)         17)       Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s).       20)       Other:									
17) 🛄 🛙	ntormation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTU-1449) Paper No(s).	20, 0.001.								

Ż

٠

Art Unit: 1653

Ì

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## **STATUS OF CLAIMS**

Claims 1-12 are pending in this application.

## **RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT**

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-3, 7 and 8, drawn to the formulations comprising EGF for treating psoriasis, classified in class 514, subclass 12, for example.
- II. Claims 4, 5, and 6, drawn to topical formulations comprising EGF in combination with other active ingredient(s), classified in class 514, subclass depending on the elected ingredient(s).
- III. Claims 9 and 10, drawn to products comprising, a precursor of EGF such as FGF or compounds with similar biological action as EGF, such as urogastrone or fractions of the EGF molecule and a method for treating psoriasis patients, classified in class 514, subclass 12, for example.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons: Inventions I and II or III are related as mutually exclusive species in an intermediate-final product relationship. Distinctness is proven for claims in this relationship if the intermediate product is useful to make other than the final product (MPEP § 806.04(b), 3rd paragraph), and the species are patentably distinct (MPEP § 806.04(h)). In the instant case, the intermediate product is deemed to be useful as an antibacterial agents and the inventions are deemed patentably distinct

Art Unit: 1653

· >

since there is nothing on this record to show them to be obvious variants. Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions anticipated by the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Inventions II and III are distinct one from the other. Inventions are distinct from one another because they have use by themselves and have different structures, different modes of operation, different effects and different protocols.

Furthermore, a reference which would render obvious claims drawn to one of the inventions may not obviate claims drawn to other inventions - absent ancillary evidence. Moreover, the computer and the library searches are not coextensive. Hence, it would be an undue burden to examine all of the inventions in one application.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

In the event that applicant may elect **Invention II or III**, applicant is further required to elect a specie(s) for the elected Invention.

Art Unit: 1653

. .

## **ELECTION OF SPECIES**

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon (within the elected invention), including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of (a) the invention and (b) an election of the species (in case Invention II or invention III is elected) to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Page 5

Art Unit: 1653

,

. >

1. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to F.T. Moezie whose telephone number is (703) 305-4508 or Dr. LOW (SPE) at 308-2923.

~

J.J. Wlay